Deskbook / Policy Assessment

Team 1

Team Members

- Jay Mandelbaum, IDA
- Les Andersen, DRC
- Howard Berkowitz, LMCO
- Don Craig, Rockwell Collins
- Dick Engwall, RL Engwall & Associates
- Eric Estill, GE AE
- David Gallardo, NAVAIR/JSF
- Dale Iverson, Raytheon
- George Noyes, DRC
- Roger Pratt, SAALT
- Joe Dimercurlo, LMCO
- Mark Miller, ONR
- Parker Sykes, SME

Positive Observations

DeskBook:

- Excellent capture of Definitions and Matrix
  - Minority opinion, definitions too stringent, may cause some programs to be put on hold
- The Matrix is very clear on how to integrate manufacturing readiness into the existing system processes and progress to a MRL 10
- Para 3.3.2 that has manufacturing personnel involved in the AoA
- Deskbook is reasonably well written, no major flaws
- Can be used as a forcing function with subcontractors and open risk dialogue earlier
- Risks is now seen as an opportunity to improve and an integal part of program and technical management

Positive Observations

Policy:

- Tying MRAs to PDR/CDR/PRR is a good forcing function
- Great step in formalizing MRLs/MRAs
- Like MRAs as a part of the Source Selection Process
- Award Fee is a good tool to incentivize implementation of MRLs

Negative Observations

Draft Deskbook Comments:

- Page 3.5 states an “initial MRA will be conducted for MS A” and this does not match mandatory requirement for TRAs, it sounds like there are two MRAs required for MS A decision, need to clarify that mandatory MRAs are accomplished only with mandatory TRAs
- 3.3.3 sounds like you are developing a preferred supplier list, vice looking at the industrial base, need to reword
- Para 5.5.5 Concerned that Technologists will scream when they see that they are responsible for manufacturing on par with design
  - Minority opinion, this is a good thing
- Deskbook is missing how to identify what products/processes needs an MRA, e.g. mirror TRA process
- Should I be using my MRL Exit criteria or MRL Checklist to evaluate a program
- Deskbook will not solve all problems: Handoff between S&T and Program Office lacks integration despite Tech Transfer Plans…

Negative Observations

Draft Policy Comments:

- Prefer new proposed policy that ties to PDR/CDR vice Milestones
- Proposed Policy letter only requires pilot projects only, there are no follow-up requirements

Recommended Actions

(Opportunities)

- Build on natural customer pull that exists in the PDR/CDR environment and drive cross-functional concurrency in the Gov/Industry sector
- Policy letter add the need for a Maturation Plan for ensuring that manufacturability/producibility is built into a program
- POM process needs to identify and fund manufacturing maturation activities
- Competitive Prototyping should be in a production relevant environment
- DoD/Service/Agency Roadmaps should have a section on the role of manufacturing maturity on their programs
- Update MRL Checklist to link to MRL Exit Criteria (Matrix)
- Differentiate between the Manufacturing Maturation Plans that are proactive and reactive.

Recommended Actions

(Opportunities continued)

- Page 3.12, para 3.3.5.2 need to pay attention to rate is covered well here, and should highlight in section 1
- We should define “Manufacturing Subject Matter Expert” in the Deskbook and it should identify some general skills and some domain specific skills
- Add a graphic to link MRLs to levels in Deskbook

Summary

- Great First Step
- Don’t make this a BOHICA
- Concerned about the lack of skills and resources
- You get what you ask for
- Is there a way to measure to maturity or success of implementation (e.g. Baldrige-like criteria)?